

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

The drawings have been objected to as not illustrating a plate comprising a stopper for a yoke as recited in claim 38. Claim 38 has been amended so as to no longer recite a stopper. As a result, withdrawal of this objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim 38 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Further, claim 38 has been rejected for containing a limitation which lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 38 has been amended so as to address both of these matters. As a result, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 30, 31, 33, 36-42 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coen (US 3,176,086). Claims 32 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coen. Claims 37, 39 and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coen in view of Stewart (US 6,373,957). Claims 37 and 39-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coen in view of Sugawara (JP 53-121613) or Henricksen (US 3,991,286). Claims 33 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coen in view of Knowles (US 2,295,483) or Cahill (US 5,940,522).

Claims 34 and 35 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

Claim 30 has been amended so as to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the above-mentioned rejections. Further, claims 31 and 38 have been amended and claim 46 has been added.

Non-elected claims 10-29 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

It is hereby submitted that the above-mentioned rejections are no longer applicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 30 is patentable over Coen, since claim 30 recites a loud speaker having, in part, a magnetic circuit having a yoke and a magnetic gap, wherein the yoke has an expansion provided at

an outer circumference of the yoke and a cut provided at an outer circumference of the expansion, and a frame having at least one clip section, wherein the expansion and the at least one clip section couple the magnetic circuit and the frame. Coen fails to disclose or suggest a magnetic circuit and a frame as recited in claim 30.

Coen discloses a speaker 10 having a speaker basket 20 connected to a magnetic housing 14. The magnetic housing 14 has an exterior shoulder 26 on which a flange 32 of the speaker basket 20 rests. The speaker basket 20 is connected to the magnet housing 14 by the deformation of a lip 24 of the magnet housing 14. The lip 24 is deformed such that a number of deformations 60 are formed, whereby the flange 32 of the speaker basket 20 is held between the deformations 60 and the exterior shoulder 26. (See column 2, lines 3-69 and Figures 1-4).

In the rejection, the flange 32 of the speaker basket 20 is indicated as corresponding to the at least one clip section of the frame recited in claim 30. Further, the exterior shoulder 26 is indicated as corresponding to the expansion of the magnetic circuit recited in claim 30. However, it is apparent that the exterior shoulder 26 does not have a cut provided at an outer circumference thereof as is the case with the expansion recited in claim 30. As a result, the exterior shoulder 26 of Coen does not correspond to the claimed expansion. As a result, Coen fails to disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 30.

As for (1) Stewart, (2) Sugawara and Henricksen, and (3) Knowles and Cahill, these references are relied upon as disclosing (1) a heat radiator for contacting a yoke, (2) a heat radiator for contacting a yoke and protruding into a space of a voice, and (3) holes in a coil bobbin that are lower than a level of damper. However, none of these references discloses or suggests the above-discussed expansion as recited in claim 30.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 30-46 are allowable over the references relied upon in the above-mentioned rejections. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 30-46. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 30-46 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Katsuya SHIMOMURA et al.

By: David M. Ovedovitz
David M. Ovedovitz
Registration No. 45,336
Attorney for Applicants

DMO/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 27, 2004